

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application as amended herein is respectfully requested.

In the Non-Final Office Action dated July 11, 2008, the Examiner rejects claims 15, 17, 18, 20, 22-27, 29, 30 and 47. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that for at least the reasons discussed below, the claims are allowable in view of the prior art of record.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

I. Claims 15, 17, 18, 20, 22-27, 29, 30 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,652,615 (hereinafter "Bryant") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,384 (hereinafter "Block").

II. Briefly, the subject application pertains to a system wherein various geographic regions receive a composite video signal with a main audio track and an alternative audio track. One of these tracks contains geographic region-specific information.¹ More particularly, the subject application teaches several composite signals. In one embodiment, these composite signals include segments in a video program that are deemed inappropriate to some viewers, for example, explicit audio content that is inappropriate for young children. In another embodiment, there are segments in the

composite video signal that are geographic region-specific. As such, a producer, broadcaster, or distributor is able to modify these composite video signals to include alternative audio tracks that is either more suitable for young children or more informative to viewers based on geographic regions.

In one example disclosed by the subject application, a composite signal includes main audio tracks with alternating A and B segments, A1 B1 A2 B2 A3 B3...Bn, with all the B segments containing objectable language not suitable for children. The producer, broadcaster, or distributor is able to modify this main audio track to obtain an alternative audio track that is more suitable to children by replacing all the B segments with new C segments, A1 C1 A2 C2 A3 C3...Cn, to obtain an alternative audio track. However, all the A segments in the alternative audio track are identical to the A segments in the main audio track, with the C segment being more suitable for children.

In another example that exemplifies geographic region-specific information, a commercial may be incorporated in the composite signal with a main audio track being generic to viewers in the United States. The producer, broadcaster, or distributor is able to modify the main audio track to include an additional audio track that is specific to Canada. Thus, viewers in the United States and Canada are able to watch the same commercial, but viewers in Canada are able to listen to different audio content than viewers in the United States. This additional audio track could be the telephone number or store location of a store specific to the geographic region.

Additionally, the video signal processor is adapted to receive the secondary

audio program channel with alternative audio track by selectively turning on/off an electronic latch on a remote control device. As such, the viewer is able to selectively listen to the generic main audio track or the secondary alternative audio track with geographic region-specific information.

III. The Examiner asserts that Bryant in view of Block renders obvious the subject application. However, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that Bryant, in view of Block, fails to teach or suggest the limitations recited in independent claim 15.

Independent claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, "...wherein a first of said video signal processors is disposed in a first of said geographic areas, having its selector set to receive the alternate audio track and generating a first output audio signal with a small number of segments being specific to said first geographic location; and wherein a second of said video signal processors is disposed in a second of said geographic areas, having its selector set to receive the alternative audio tracks, and generating a second output audio signal with a small number of segments being specific to said second geographic location, the remaining segments of said second output signal being identical to the remaining segments of said first output signal..." Independent claim 22 recites similar variants of claim 15.

Contrary to independent claim 15, Bryant fails to disclose the above limitations because the broadcast program received by one customer is different from the

broadcast program received by another customer. To be more specific, Bryant discloses that a set top box (STB) 200 includes a memory buffer 230 for storing a profile of a customer. The broadcast signal is selectively decoded by the STB 200 and compared to the profile stored in the memory buffer 230. This comparison results in routing a specific broadcast signal with a specific advertisement to a targeted customer (see e.g., Col. 4, Lines 1-9).

An example disclosed in Bryant is further used in support of the argument presented above, in which Bryant fails to teach or suggest that the second output audio signal with a small number of segments is specific to a second geographic location and the remaining segments of the second output signal is identical to the remaining segments of the first output signal.

In this example, Bryant discloses that "program_1" can be targeted to a rich-retired audience having a STB 200 that stores a customer profile that is indicative of their age, income, location, etc. The STB 200 of a young-married-with-children audience also includes a customer profile that is indicative of their age, income, location, etc. for designating "program_2" to their STB 200. However, "program_1" and "program_2" both have different video and audio fills that is conditioned for a specific audience (see e.g., Col. 4, Lines 1-5 and Col. 6, Lines 57-64).

With respect to the rich-retired audience, the video fill is identified as "ES_PID_3" 631 and the audio fill is identified as "ES_PID_4" 641. The video fill 631 and audio fill 641 are advertisements of "program_1" that are specific to a targeted audience, such as

the rich-retired audience in this example (see e.g., Col. 7, Lines 4-7). In this example, the video fill and the audio fill of the broadcast signal (i.e., an advertisement) could be directed to the needs of a retired audience, such as healthcare.

On the other hand, the young-married-with-children audience is designated with "program_2" having a video fill identified as "ES_PID_5" 651 and an audio fill identified as "ES_PID_6" 661. The video fill 651 and the audio fill 661 are advertisements of "program_2" that are specific to a targeted audience, such as the young-married-with-children audience (see e.g., Col. 7, Lines 10-12). In this example, the video fill and the audio fill of the broadcast signal (i.e., an advertisement) could be directed to the needs of a married audience, such as investment planning.

Although the street box 160 or the STB 200 of Bryant can select program content for two demographically different audiences **based on the profile stored in the memory buffer 230** (see e.g., Col. 4, Lines 1-5 and Col. 7, Lines 12-15), the advertisement received by the rich-retired audience is, however, completely different from the advertisement received by the young-married-with-children audience.

However, the broadcast signal with alternative audio track of the subject application is not controlled by a profile as in Bryant. Instead, the broadcast signal is modified by a producer, broadcaster, or distributor to produce a generic broadcast signal with alternative audio track that is specific to a geographic region, keeping in mind that each STB of a specific region views the same video signal but listens to different alternative audio tracks.

Since each targeted audience is viewing and listening to a completely different broadcasting signal controlled by the customer's profile stored in STB 200, Bryant therefore, fails to teach or suggest the limitation of "...generating a second output audio signal with a small number of segments being specific to said second geographic location, the remaining segments of said second output signal being identical to the remaining segments of said first output signal..." as recited in independent claim 15.

IV. In addition to the above arguments, another example is used to distinguish the subject application from Bryant and Block. Reference is made to Fig. 1 of Bryant.

For example, street box 160 is located in New York City (NYC) and each of the three STB 200s includes a personal customer profile. The STB 200 on the left is located at a rich-retired customer's home located in Brooklyn, the middle STB 200 is located at a young-married-with-children's home located in Manhattan, and the STB 200 on the right is located at a college student's apartment located in the Bronx.

Since each of the three STB 200s includes a customer profile that is distinguished from the other customer profiles, each respective STB 200 will receive a different broadcast signal (i.e., advertisement) based on their customer profile, even though the STB 200s are located in NYC (see e.g., Col. 4, Lines 1-5 and Col. 7, Lines 1- 17). As such, the rich-retired customer will be viewing and listening to a different video fill and audio fill, respectively, from the young-married-with-children couple and the college student.

By contrast, independent claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, "...a broadcasting apparatus adapted to transmit several composite video signals to several respective geographic areas, each of said composite video signals including a video broadcast channel that carries a video signal for an audio-visual program, a main audio channel that carries a standard audio track for said program, and an SAP channel that carries an alternative audio track for said program, said alternative audio track being a modified version of said standard audio track that is specific to the respective geographic area, said standard audio track and said alternative audio track consisting of dialog in the same language..." Independent claim 22 recites similar variants thereof.

The subject application, as briefly described above, is directed towards a broadcasting apparatus that is adapted to transmit several composite video signals to several respective geographic areas. The composite video signal is modified by a producer, broadcaster, or distributor to produce a generic broadcast signal with alternative audio track that is specific to a geographic region, wherein the alternative audio track includes geographic region-specific information.

For example, if there are three STBs located in NYC, one in Brooklyn for the rich-retired couple, one in Manhattan for the young-married-with-children couple, and one in the Bronx for the college student, each STB will be viewing the same video signal (i.e., advertisement). However, in accordance with the subject application, each STB will be listening to a different alternative audio track that includes geographic region-specific information that is specific to a respective geographic area. In other words, the rich-

retired customer in Brooklyn will be viewing the same advertisement as the college student in the Bronx, but on the other hand, will be receiving an alternative audio track that may include the local street address or local telephone number of a vendor that distributes the goods displayed in the advertisement.

Therefore, Bryant fails to teach or suggest the limitation of "...a broadcasting apparatus adapted to transmit several composite video signals to several respective geographic areas, each of said composite video signals including a video broadcast channel that carries a video signal for an audio-visual program, a main audio channel that carries a standard audio track for said program, and an SAP channel that carries an alternative audio track for said program, said alternative audio track being a modified version of said standard audio track that is specific to the respective geographic area, said standard audio track and said alternative audio track consisting of dialog in the same language..." as recited in independent claim 15.

V. The Examiner additionally cites the reference Block as rendering obvious the subject application. Similar to Bryant, Block is also silent with respect to the limitations discussed in sections **III** and **IV**. Therefore, Block also fails to teach or suggest independent claims 15 and 22.


VI. In view of the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Bryant, alone or in combination with Block, fails to teach or suggest independent claims

15 and 22. Claims 17, 18 and 20 and claims 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30 and 47 depend on their respective base claims and are therefore also allowable for at least the above reasons.

To expedite prosecution of this application to allowance, the examiner is invited to call the Applicants' undersigned representative to discuss any issues relating to this application.

Respectfully submitted,

GOTTLIEB, RACKMAN & REISMAN, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant
270 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016-0601
Telephone: (212) 684 3900
Telefax: (212) 684 3999

By: 
Tiberiu Weisz, Esq.
Reg. No. 29,876

Date December 9, 2008